

REMARKS

The applicants would like to thank Examiner Hossain for the courtesies extended to the applicants' representative during an interview conducted September 23, 2008. The above-presented amendments are made in accordance with the substance of the interview. As acknowledged by the Examiner, the proposed amendments as discussed in the interview and as memorialized in this response overcome the art of record.

In particular, claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-11, 13-18, 21-22, and 24-32 remain pending and at issue in the above identified patent application. Of the claims at issue, claims 1, 16, and 32 are independent. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance, and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In general, claims 1, 16, and 32 have been amended to include the recitation that an application is configured to suspend operation of a process configured to temporally sort and store data when the application accesses data stored in physical memory. In particular, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an electronic program guide application that is configured to cause a processor to suspend operation of a temporal sorting process when the electronic program guide application accesses program guide data stored in physical memory. Similarly, claims 16 and 32 recite, *inter alia*, suspending the operation of a temporal sorting process when an application accesses data stored in physical memory, and an application configured to suspend operation of at least two low-priority temporal sorting processes when the application accesses data stored in physical memory.

In the Office action dated July 3, 2008, the pending independent claims were rejected as being unpatentable over Bhatt (US 2002/0073426) in view of Trovato (US 6,445,306), and in further view of Brotz (US 7,039,929). The remaining claims were rejected as being

unpatentable over Bhatt in view of Trovato, Brotz, and in further view of Hofmann (U.S. 5,883,677).

As discussed with the examiner, none of the art of record teaches or suggests the suspension of temporal sorting and storage of data when an application accesses data stored in physical memory. Specifically, none of Bhatt, Trovato, Brotz, or Hofman describes the suspension of a sorting process as recited in amended claims 1, 16, and 32. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 16, and 32 are in condition for allowance.

The remaining claims depended upon one of independent claims 1, 16, or 32, and have been amended for stylistic purposes and/or to ensure that dependencies are properly maintained. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that remaining claims are also in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof are respectfully requested. If there is any matter that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


Todd N. Snyder, Registration No. 41,320
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: October 3, 2008
The DIRECTV Group, Inc.
CA / LA1 / A109
2230 E. Imperial Highway
El Segundo, CA 90245
Telephone: 310-964-0560